

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 09 2007

1001 G. STREET N.W, ELEVENTH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001



BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

TEL: 202.824.3000
FAX: 202.824.3001

www.bannerwitcoff.com

To: Examiner Chelcie Daye, USPTO, GAU 2161
Company:
Fax: 15712738300
Phone:

From: Gary D. Fedorochko/Lisa A. Bahm
Fax:
Phone: 202-824-3159

Re:

Re: USSN 10/646,472 - Proposed Interview Agenda

Date Of Transmission: 3/9/2007 3:07:28 PM
Number Of Pages Including This Cover Sheet: 6

Important/Confidential: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. This message contains information from the law firm of Banner & Witcoff, Ltd. which may be privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, retention, archiving, or copying of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately at our telephone number listed above. We will be happy to arrange for the return of this message to our offices at no cost to you.

CHICAGO

WASHINGTON, D.C.

BOSTON

PORTLAND, OR

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 09 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Jamie WAKEAM et al.

Serial 10/646,472

No.:

Filed: August 21, 2003

For: ELECTRONIC INK PROCESSING

Atty.Docket No.: 003797.00618

Group Art Unit: 2161

Examiner: Daye, C.

Confirmation 8481
No.:**PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA**

Date: Tuesday, March 13, 2007

Time: 10:30 AM

Participants: Examiner Daye, Gary Fedorochko (35,509), Mark Wilinski

1) Discuss differences between proposed amended independent claims 7, 19, and 25 and U.S. published application no. 20020133507 to Holenstein et al. ("Holenstein") and US patent 5588147 to Neeman et al. ("Neeman"). For example, with respect to claim 7, Holenstein fails to teach or suggest "if the corresponding node in the first data structure is inaccessible, preventing the change from occurring in the second data structure" as recited. Instead, Holenstein at paragraph [0157] merely demonstrates the communication interconnections *between* the originating node and the other nodes in the system suffer from irrecoverable errors. To clarify this distinction further, Applicants propose amending claim 7 as set forth below to recite the additional feature of "establishing a connection between the second data structure and the first data structure." Neeman fails to cure the above noted deficiency of Holenstein.

2) Proposed amended independent claim 7 further recites features related to "if the corresponding node in the first data structure is accessible, determining, if the change to the second data structure creates a mandatory collision" *and* "if the corresponding node in the first data structure is accessible, determining, if the change to the second data structure creates a discretionary collision." The non-final office action of February 1, 2007 at pages 3-4 correctly indicates that Holenstein is silent with respect to the recited features. Applicants submit that Neeman fails to teach or suggest the recited features, at